EXHIBIT 2

Case 1:17-md-02800-TWT Document 1134-3 Filed 06/09/20 Page 2 of 3 Case: 20-10249 Date Filed: 05/04/2020 Page: 1 of 2

Rev. 4/18

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

CIVIL APPEAL STATEMENT

Please TYPE.	Attach addit	tional pages if necessary.	11th Circuit Docket Number: _ N	lo. 20-10249		
Caption:			District and Division: Northern Distr	ern District of Georgia		
Shiyang Huang, et al.			Name of Judge: Hon. Thomas	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			Nature of Suit: class action			
V.			Date Complaint Filed: Dec. 6, 2017 District Court Docket Number: 1	District Court Docket Number: 1:17-md-02800-TWT		
Drian Chaster et al						
Brian Spector, et al.			Has this matter previously been Yes No If Yes, provide (a) Caption: (b) Citation: (c) Docket Number:	If Yes, provide (a) Caption: (b) Citation:		
		Attorney Name	Mailing Address	Telephone, Fax, Email		
For Appellant Plaintiff Defenda Other (S	nt	Melissa A. Holyoak Hamilton Lincoln Law Institute	1629 K Street NW, Suit Washington, D.C. 2000		melissaholyoak@gmail.com 573-823-5377	
Objectors Theodore H. Frank and David R. Watkins						
For Appellee: Kenneth S. Canfield Plaintiff Doffermyre Shields Canfield & Knowles, LLC Defendant Other (Specify)			E STE 1725	404-881-8900 404-920-3246 (fax) kcanfield@dsckd.com		
David L. Balser King & Spalding, LLP Attorneys for Defendants-Appellees			1180 PEACHTREE ST NE STE 1600 ATLANTA, GA 30309-3521			
Please CIRCLE/CHECK/COMPLETE the items below and on page 2 that apply.						
Jurisd	iction	Nature of Judgment	Type of Order		Relief	
✓ Federal 0	Question	Final Judgment, 28 USC 1291	☐ Dismissal/Jurisdiction	Amount So	ught by Plaintiff:	
Diversity		_	☐ Default Judgment	<u> </u>		
US Plaint	iff	Interlocutory Order, 28 USC 1292(a)(1)	Summary Judgment	Amount Sought by Defendant: \$ Awarded: \$		
US Defer	ndant	Interlocutory Order Certified, 28 USC 1292(b)	Judgment/Bench Trial			
		Interlocutory Order, Qualified Immunity	☐ Judgment/Jury Verdict ☐ Judgment/Directed Verdict/NOV	to Injunctions		
		Final Agency Action (Review)	Injunction	TRO Prelimi	nary 🔲 Granted	
		54(b)	Other Class Action Final Order and Judgment	Permai	nent 🔲 Denied	

Case 1:17-md-02800-TWT Document 1134-3 Filed 06/09/20 Page 3 of 3 Case: 20-10249 Date Filed: 05/04/2020 Page: 2 of 2

11th Circuit Docket Number: 20-10249Page 2 Based on your present knowledge: Does this appeal involve a question of First Impression? Yes No What is the issue you claim is one of First Impression? _ Will the determination of this appeal turn on the interpretation or application of a particular case or statute? If Yes, provide (a) Case Name/Statute Amchem Prods. v. Windsor, 521 U.S. 591 (1997); Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp., 527 U.S. 815 (1999); Juris v. Inamed, 685 F.3d 1294 (11th Cir. 2012). (b) Citation Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4) (c) Docket Number if unreported _ Is there any case now pending or about to be brought before this court or any other court or administrative agency that (a) Arises from substantially the same case or controversy as this appeal? Yes No (b) Involves an issue that is substantially the same, similar, or related to an issue in this appeal? Yes No If Yes, provide (a) Case Name _ (b) Citation (c) Docket Number if unreported _____ (d) Court or Agency ___ Will this appeal involve a conflict of law (a) Within the Eleventh Circuit? ☐Yes ✓No (b) Among circuits? ☐Yes ✓No If Yes, explain briefly: Issues proposed to be raised on appeal, including jurisdictional challenges: Supreme Court precedent requires separate representation under Rule 23(a)(4) where subgroups of class members have materially different claims creating fundamental intra-class conflicts. Did the district court err as a matter of law when it certified a single nationwide settlement class, though many class members have materially different causes of actions with materially different legal remedies, including state statutorydamages claims that were sufficiently colorable to survive a motion to dismiss? Did the district court's class-certification decision impermissibly rely upon inadmissible expert evidence and class counsel's proposed opinion instead of providing the scrutiny required by Rule 23 and the Supreme Court? Was the district court's delegation of the drafting of the final approval order fundamentally unfair where the proposed order reflects substantially verbatim duplication of class counsel's proposed opinion--submitted ex parte and then hidden by the district court and class counsel--that overreaches the court's findings from the fairness hearing, and abused the process to make factually unsupported findings against opposing counsel? And if so, is reassignment of the case required? I CERTIFY THAT I SERVED THIS CIVIL APPEAL STATEMENT ON THE CLERK OF THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT AND SERVED A COPY ON EACH PARTY OR THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD, THIS _____4th ___DAY OF ____May_____, ___2020__ Melissa A. Holyoak /s Melissa A. Holyoak NAME OF COUNSEL (Print) SIGNATURE OF COUNSEL